

1 GLYNN & FINLEY, LLP  
 CLEMENT L. GLYNN, Bar No. 57117  
 2 ADAM FRIEDENBERG, Bar No. 205778  
 One Walnut Creek Center  
 3 100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 500  
 Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
 4 Telephone: (925) 210-2800  
 Facsimile: (925) 945-1975  
 5 Email: [cglynn@glynnfinley.com](mailto:cglynn@glynnfinley.com)  
[afriedenberg@glynnfinley.com](mailto:afriedenberg@glynnfinley.com)

6 Attorneys for Defendant  
 7 ConocoPhillips Company

8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 HOUTAN PETROLEUM, INC.	)	Case No. 3:07-cv-5627
12 Plaintiff,	)	
13 vs.	)	<b><u>DEFENDANT CONOCOPHILLIPS</u></b>
14 CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY, a Texas	)	<b><u>COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR PRETRIAL</u></b>
15 corporation and DOES 1 through 10,	)	<b><u>CONFERENCE OR MOTION IN LIMINE</u></b>
16 Inclusive	)	<b><u>HEARING</u></b>
17 Defendants.	)	<b>Trial Date: February 11, 2008</b>
	)	<b>Time: 10:00 a.m.</b>
	)	<b>Courtroom: 1</b>
	)	<b>Before: Hon. Samuel Conti</b>

18

19 On January 11, 2008, the Court scheduled this matter for a jury trial to commence on  
 20 February 11, 2008. The Court subsequently issued its Jury Trial Preparation Order. The Jury  
 21 Trial Preparation Order provides that motions in limine will be heard at the pretrial conference  
 22 and requires that the parties file motions in limine 10 days prior to the pretrial conference.  
 23 (Docket No. 44 at § A(9).) The Court, however, has not scheduled a pretrial conference to  
 24 precede the February 11, 2008, trial setting. (The Court previously scheduled a pretrial  
 25 conference for June 13, 2008. (Docket No. 24.))

26 ConocoPhillips intends to file appropriate motions in limine that could, if granted, have  
 27 an impact on the issues remaining for trial. In addition, as ConocoPhillips will file its answer  
 28 and counterclaims today, under the normal requirements of the Federal Rules, this case would

1 not yet be at issue as of the date scheduled for trial. Further, there may be evidentiary and  
2 procedural issues that could be addressed prior to the commencement of trial. For all of these  
3 reasons, ConocoPhillips believes a pretrial conference or further status conference would assist  
4 the Court and parties in addressing various pretrial issues. In the event the Court is not inclined  
5 to order a pretrial conference, then ConocoPhillips would respectfully request that the Court  
6 schedule a date for hearing motions in limine sufficiently in advance of the trial to allow the  
7 Court and parties to understand what issues remain to be tried.

8 Dated: January 19, 2008

9 GLYNN & FINLEY, LLP  
10 CLEMENT L. GLYNN  
11 ADAM FRIEDENBERG  
12 One Walnut Creek Center  
13 100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 500  
14 Walnut Creek, CA 94596

15 By   
16 Attorneys for Defendant  
17 ConocoPhillips Company  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28